

return to Cavini - who also very correctly  
expounded the functions of the collecting or  
weeping hair, as he terms them of the  
style of the antheriferous flower. Cavini's  
account of himself is also interesting his  
early desire to act up to his name - the  
relapses which from political causes he  
met with and which prevented his following  
the astronomical and engineering career of  
his great predecessor, and his final adoption  
of the judicial line in which he rose to be  
chief judge of one of the Metropolitan Courts  
and in which capacity he found leisure for  
his synanthropological pursuits.

Why is it that we see nothing yet of  
any continuation of Flora of America.  
It is more than ever wanted now that  
your notices of N. American plants are  
scattered over such a number of  
Transactions, Proceedings, Reports of  
Botanical Expeditions, etc. etc. that it is  
quite a Herculean labour to hunt them  
out - and you must only attribute to this  
cause any omission you may find of  
references to them.

Ever your sincerely

Send you by post a  
corroborative copy of my  
Cavini paper

George Donnan

25, WILTON PLACE.  
S.W.

Dec 25/71

My dear Gray

It is a long while since I have  
written to you - but I have been steadily  
at work entailing so much writing that  
I got very lazy at correspondence. I have  
finished the Compositae and written  
them out for press all but a few words  
and references that I have to pick up  
here and there - this I do at odd times  
as I am now at work again on the  
Asteraceae - there are few N. American  
Genera that I have had to take upon  
trust having no specimens, there are  
*Ruephyllum* A. Gr.

*Monoptilon* Torr. & Gr.

The little genus published in the same paper

*Ocotea* Torr. & Gr.

Have you specimens to spare of either of  
them?

I am puzzled where to put *Clappia*, our

specimen is very imperfect

I was much puzzled by Nuttall's

account of *Parastrephia* with the ♀  
in the center and the ♂ in the circumference,  
contrary to the absolutely universal rule  
in Compositae - on looking at the fragments  
in his herbarium I am convinced that he  
was mistaken - the heads appear to be  
neatly and perhaps sometimes quite  
unisexual but I can see no ♀ fr. surrounded  
by ♂ ones - the plant is a Racekner of  
Allegan transferred by Walpers to *Pernonia*  
on account of the pappus we have very  
good specimens of pappus which show  
a good genus nearly allied to *Racekner*,  
Nuttall's *Helogyne* may be an *Ophryosporus*  
but I cannot be certain as I cannot  
examine the authors in the fragmentary  
specimen His *Polenosthea* is a *Loageta* and  
his *Heterodonta* a *Conocarpus* and his  
*Chirodonta* a *Heterosperma* - and this  
disposes of his Curonian *Andegynus* genera  
the following is the statistical result  
of my compilation

	Genera accepted specimen plate only	Doubtful monotypic genera	New Genera	Total	Estimated of species	Genera Synonymy
<i>Veronicaeum</i>	35	3	3	41	465	62
<i>Eupatoriaceae</i>	33	2	—	35	705	20
<i>Asteroides</i>	80	7	1	88	1420	155
<i>Malvaceae</i>	124	6	2	132	2150	209
<i>Helianthoides</i>	127	0	5	132	1055	211
<i>Helianthoides</i>	56	2	2	60	290	29
<i>Butterfideae</i>	40	1	—	41	650	99
<i>Senecionideae</i>	39	1	2	42	1350	24
<i>Calceolaceae</i>	0	—	—	0	215	15
<i>Asteroides</i>	16	—	—	16	250	33
<i>Cynaroides</i>	35	1	—	36	800	120
<i>Muticaceae</i>	46	1	2	49	450	94
<i>Achroaceae</i>	55	1	—	56	720	159
<b>Total</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>9570</b>	<b>1345</b>

After having gone through the order  
I turned to Copin's general paper in his  
*Opusculum* - I had a great prejudice against  
him on account of the confusion produced  
by his enormous multiplication of generic  
names and his difficult terminology - I  
was therefore surprised to find how good  
his views generally seemed to be on natural  
affinity his system was I think much  
spoiled by Lefebvre & de Candolle's deviations  
from it and most of the changes I had  
proposed in the latter are little more than a